Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MASTEROBJECTS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

EBAY, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.: 3:12-cv-680 JSC

SECOND ORDER RE: ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL (Dkt. No. 90)

The Court previously denied Plaintiff MasterObjects, Inc.'s ("MasterObjects") Administrative Motion to File Under Seal a Joint Letter Brief regarding MasterObjects' request to compel Defendant eBay, Inc. ("eBay") to produce certain damages documents (Dkt. No. 90) and eighteen exhibits submitted therewith for failure to comply with Local Rule 79-5. (Dkt. No. 96.) The Court found that eBay, as the as the party asserting that the documents were confidential, failed to establish that the documents were in fact confidential as it: (1) failed to file "a declaration as required by subsection 79-5(d)(1)(A) establishing that all of the designated material is sealable" see L.R. 79-5(e)(1); and (2) did not "narrowly tailor" the request for sealing, and instead, sought to file the *entire* joint statement and exhibits under seal, see L.R. 79-5(b).

United States District Court

Northern District of California

eBay subsequently submitted a declaration in support of sealing (Dkt. No. 100);
however, the declaration fails to address the second grounds for the Court's prior Order, and
instead, continues to maintain that the entire Joint Statement and eighteen exhibits submitted
therewith should be sealed. This request violates Rule 79-5(b)'s requirement that a request
for sealing be narrowly tailored. While certain trade secret documents and the facts discussed
therein may in fact be confidential, the parties' legal arguments in the joint statement are not
confidential nor is every portion of every exhibit. For example, the Court fails to see how the
email at Docket No. 90-10 contains confidential information "describing planning, analytics
and development of eBay's website." (Dkt. No. 100 at 3.) Likewise, the entire six page
email at Docket No. 90-11 cannot be said to contain confidential information "describing
planning, analytics and development of eBay's website." (Id.) To the extent these and other
emails may contain some confidential information, eBay has wholly failed to establish good
cause to redact all the information including the email recipients and the date and time of the
emails. Further, with respect to deposition testimony, while portions of the testimony may be
confidential because they describe the "technical operation and analytics of eBay's website"
(id. at 4), it is not evident why this confidentiality applies to those portions of the testimony
where the deponent is identifying other employees or departments within eBay, nor does it
apply to colloquies between counsel. (See, e.g., Dkt. No. 90-23 at 81:18-24, 82:8-20.)

Accordingly, the motion to seal at Docket No. 90 is DENIED for a second time. eBay has until Monday, November 4, 2013, to file a declaration which comports with Local Rule 79-5 and addresses the issues raised herein. If eBay fails to timely file a declaration, MasterObjects shall file (1) the unredacted Joint Statement, (2) Exhibits 1-15 to the Declaration of Spencer Hosie in Support of Motion to Compel Production of Damages Documents, and (3) Exhibits 1-3 to the Declaration of Christopher Shield in Opposition to Motion to Compel Production of Damages Documents on the public docket in accordance with Local Rule 79-5(e)(2).

//

//

Case3:12-cv-00680-JSC Document102 Filed10/31/13 Page3 of 3

JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Northern District of California

United States District Court

2	

IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 | Dated: October 31, 2013